



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,355	04/02/2001	Edward J. Gottsman	38836.00.0044	7180
30498	7590	07/28/2008		
ACCENTURE				
C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.				
222 NORTH LASALLE STREET				
CHICAGO, IL 60601				
EXAMINER				
CORRIELUS, JEAN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2162				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09824355	4/2/01	GOTTSMAN, EDWARD J.	38836.00.0044

ACCENTURE
C/O VEDDER PRICE KAUFMAN & KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 NORTH LASALLE STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

Jean M. Corrielus

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2162

20080723

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Page 3 of the examiner, section 2, the examiner meant to recite "claim 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) anticipated by Benson US Patent no. 5,650,800."

Claim 2 which recites "wherein the row headings identify sources from which the elements are obtained and the column headings identify subject matter to which the elements relate" discloses by Benson as follow (Wherein the display 100 comprises a row headings (A-F) and column headings (1-5), wherein each icon corresponding to an element in the database (see, icons in (cell D-4), icon 158 shown in cell D-1; perimeter sensor icon in cell C-3). The indication that claim 2 is objected to o as being dependent upon a rejected base claim 1, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims has been withdrawn.

/Jean M Corrielus/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162